

MEETING #31 – September 26

At a Regular Meeting of the Madison County Board of Supervisors on September 26, 2017 6:00 p.m. in the Madison County Administrative Center Auditorium located at 414 N. Main Street:

PRESENT: R. Clay Jackson, Chairman
Jonathon Weakley, Vice-Chairman
Robert Campbell, Member
Kevin McGhee, Member
Charlotte Hoffman, Member
Jack Hobbs, County Administrator
V. R. Shackelford, County Attorney
Mary Jane Costello, Asst. County Administrator/Finance Director
Jacqueline S. Frye, Deputy Clerk

Call to Order

Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

1. Determine Presence of a Quorum/Adopt Agenda

Chairman Jackson advised that a quorum was present.

Chairman Jackson called for the following addition to today's Agenda (as per the request of Supervisor Hoffman):

✓ *Item c: County Signs*

Supervisor Weakley moved that today's Agenda be approved as amended, seconded by Supervisor Hoffman. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).*

2. Public Comment:

Chairman Jackson opened the floor for public comment. With no public comment being brought forth, the public comment opportunity was closed.

3. Constitutional Officers – None

4. County Departments – None

a. Madison County Schools: Bob Chappell, School Board member, was present and advised that the school board will meet tomorrow to discuss the Ameresco proposal; he recently attended a CTE (Career Tech Educational) meeting where emphasis focused on the hydroponic growing process (i.e. plants grown without being planted in soil), cutting edge agricultural methods, and computer aided drafting techniques.

Chairman Jackson welcomed Gracie Brooks, Reporter, back from her recent leave term.

5. Committees or Organizations:

a. Auditor of Public Accounts: Mary Jane Costello, Asst. County Administrator/Finance Director, was present and provided highlights from a document provided by the Auditor of Public Accounts, pertaining to legislation passed earlier this year by the General Assembly that requires the auditors to perform a 'financial stress test' on all localities within the Commonwealth. Calculations provided today focused on FY2014 through FY2016, and showed Madison

County's percentage of 75% to 78.7%, which is within the top tier of all the localities within the State. Madison County is deemed as showing good financial stability at this time. Localities with a percentage score of less than 15% are reported to the General Assembly. The process is designed to detect localities that are in distress so as to prevent the locality from claiming bankruptcy. Part of today's document focuses on ratios, description/interpretation, and notes.

Comments from the Board

- *Chairman Jackson: Suggested that an email containing calculations on today's document be emailed to all members for review and assessment*

6. Finance

a. September 2017 Claims

\$490,219.94,128.46 (9'15'17)

\$ 12,246.90 (9'26'17)

\$502,466.84 (Total)

Highlights:

- ✓ 82% of today's claims are for quarterly and annual payments
- ✓ \$24,000.00+ (Central Shenandoah Criminal Justice Academy [training for law enforcement personnel])
- ✓ \$229,000.00 (Quarterly payment to the CVRJ)
- ✓ \$35,000.00 (Quarterly payment to the Madison County Health Department)
- ✓ \$44,000.00 (2nd quarterly payment to the MCPRA)
- ✓ \$20,000.00 (Quarterly payment to the RRCSB)
- ✓ \$21,000.00 (Annual payment to the RRRC)
- ✓ \$35,000.00 (Auditor's fee)

Supervisor Campbell moved that the Board approve September 2017 claims totaling \$502,466.84 as presented, seconded by Supervisor McGhee. **Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).**

b. Supplemental Appropriations

i. FY17 True Up adjustment for Rappahannock Juvenile Detention Center: The Finance Director advised that a true up adjustment (for the RJDC) hasn't been seen in the past years due to the County having a large credit in place. Today's charge of \$41,367.69 is due because of additional cumulative childcare days in excess of the amount of funding that was budgeted. These funds will need to be taken from the contingency fund since these funds weren't noted in the FY18 budget. It was also noted that trends show that the County's usage of the facility has increased. It was suggested that based on a discussion with court services, the County may have a significant percentage in FY18, and that the County may need to start taking a closer look at allocating additional funding for this purpose during future budgetary preparations. In closing, it was advised that the County has no option but to allocate the funding being requested.

Comments from the Board:

- *Supervisor Campbell: Feels the County is being singled out when it comes to providing funding for certain facilities*

The Finance Director advised that she has been involved in the County's budgetary process for two (2) years; the RJDC does calculations every two (2) years, but since the County had a credit in place, the County's budget wasn't affected. She also noted that the RJDC does their budget, they:

- ✓ Compile data based on operational expenses for the detention center
- ✓ Determine a number they will need from all participating localities
- ✓ Divide the compiled data pertaining to operational expenses for the detention center

And determine a number they need from all participating localities which is divided with a ratio based on a three-year calendar average (i.e. with childcare being the bulk of the costs).

Further comments:

Clarissa Berry (Commonwealth Attorney) was present and advised that the proposed costs are less than what it would cost the County to have its own juvenile detention center in place.








Steve Hoffman (former County RJDC representative) was present and advised that (to the best of his knowledge):

- ✓ The RJDC's building will be paid off this year
- ✓ The County is currently being required to pay a 'per diem' per inmate days at the facility

And feels that within the next year or so, the funding amount will more than likely increase. He also noted that the county pays a per diem amount per inmate days at the center, and feels that (in his opinion) "there are too many County Administrators running the operations that have their eye on the penny, not operations of the jail or its employees."

The Finance Director advised that documents indicated that RJDC employees are actually underpaid, as noted by a large payroll adjustment shown in their annual budget. In closing, she reported that the County's usage has increased from .6% (total usage in FY2017) to 1.8% currently.

Jurisdictions that participate in the RJCD include:

-  Fredericksburg
-  King George
-  Louisa
-  Madison
-  Orange
-  Spotsylvania
-  Stafford

- *Chairman Jackson: Suggested the County seek to appoint someone to attend meetings to represent the County at the facility*

After discussion:

- Supervisor Campbell volunteered to serve and attend one (1) finance committee meeting
- Bob Chappell (School Board member) offered to serve as the representative if the meetings times don't conflict with his other commitments

Mr. Hoffman advised that the County will only have one vote, and that during his attendance at past meetings provided no effective results.

It was also noted that the facility's finance committee consists:

✚ Finance Directors

And:

✚ Meetings are open to the general public (i.e. facility is a public entity)

Summary:

- ✓ Finance Committee: Supervisor Campbell (volunteered to attend) and the Finance
- ✓ Steve Hoffman (to provide knowledge/expertise)
- ✓ RJDC Board: Bob Chappell (volunteered to serve if there is no interference with other commitments)

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to add this topic to "Old Business" of the next meeting Agenda in order to develop a plan and recommendations.

Supervisor Campbell moved that the Board approve FY2018 proposed supplemental appropriation #05_09262017 (Rappahannock Juvenile Detention Center FY17 true-up invoice) in the amount of \$41,367.69, seconded by Supervisor Weakley.

Discussion:

- *Supervisor McGhee: Referred to the true up for the regional jail (occurred at least once) questioned if today's true up request is as the earliest that such a request would be presented (to a locality)*

The Finance Director advised that the adjustment on the regional jail was based on a cash flow reserve adjustment (as of 7/1) – this type of adjustment is usually requested earlier in the calendar year. Today's request is a 'next year' item and is being billed in the calendar year that the request relates to.

Analysis of Contingency Balance (as of 9/26/17)

Original FY18 Budget – General Provision:	\$390,000.00
Sheriff IT Reserve:	\$ (40,000.00)
Available for use (as of 9/26/17)	\$350,000.00
RJDC True Up due for FY17:	\$ (41,367.69)
Available after RJDC Adjustment:	\$308,632.31

Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).

ii. Revised Victim Witness (Budget & Including Compensation Adjustment for Jennifer Hays [retroactive to 8/1])

The Finance Director advised that today's funding request is for reallocation of grant funding for the victim witness position (changed from part-time to full-time) and to cover a compensatory adjustment for FY2018.

The Commonwealth Attorney was present and explained that the funding request is for reallocation off grant funding and to provide a salary increase to Ms. Hayes for the position (which was shifted from part-time to full-time) – shifting from part-time

to full-time has been a tremendous asset. In closing, she advised that October is "Domestic Violence Awareness Month" – her department is hosting an open house on October 24th from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. at the Commonwealth Attorney's Office.

Supervisor Campbell moved that the Board approve FY2018 proposed supplemental appropriation #06-09262017 (Victim Witness Budget for DCJS approved budget) in the amount of \$1,219.22, seconded by Supervisor Weakley. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0)*

Ms. Hayes also advised that the Victim Witness Office files claims with the Virginia Victims Fund and has received about \$10,000.00 for the locality – these funds have helped victims in the program. In closing, she advised that some of the local victims will be present at the open house to share how the Victim Witness Program has served them.

7. Minutes:

a. #30

Chairman Jackson called for corrections and/or approval of Minutes #30.

Supervisor McGhee moved that the Board approve Minutes #30 as presented, seconded by Supervisor Hoffman. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. [REDACTED] Nays: (0).*

8. Old Business:

a. Reassessment RFP: The County Administrator advised that he has been working with the Assistant County Administrator and Commissioner on the reassessment process; it was noted that the pursuit of 'adding on' to another localities cooperative reassessment services will not be a viable option (as noted in a memorandum to the Board); an .RFP document was provided for assessment/review; if the Board is comfortable with today's packet, the .RFP request will be sent tomorrow for advertisement, and will culminate on October 24th with a recommendation from the Board to approve a reassessment contractor, if the Board so deems appropriate.

The County Attorney was present advised that the RFP from 2012 was reviewed and adjustments were initiated on today's document. He suggested the County move ahead as recommended.

The County Administrator advised that there are only four (4) companies (in the State) that provide this type of work; today's RFP document is a standard form, and is similar to the document utilized by Madison and Orange in the past.

Supervisor Campbell moved that the Board authorize the County Administrator to proceed with advertising the 2019 Reassessment RFP as presented, seconded by Supervisor Hoffman. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman.*

9. New Business:

a. Building Official Services: The County Administrator advised that Wes Smith, Building Official, has been out of the office for a while with no accurate forecast for his return to work. He suggested the County take measures to cover the position if he's absent much longer, as many of his duties can't be absorbed by the current county staff. After discussions and research, the Building Official (Bob Orr) in Culpeper County has offered to help the county, if the specifics can be worked out with the Attorney for Culpeper and our County Attorney, in an effort to establish an interim arrangement with Mr. Orr until a long-term plan can be assessed. Although a contract hasn't yet been initiated, today's memorandum is for informational purposes only.

After discussion, it was clarified that today's documentation will be discussed (between legal officials in Culpeper and Madison) and a report will be provided to the Board at a later date.

- *Supervisor Campbell; Referred to the Building Official in Greene County having provided assistance to Madison in the past*

The County Administrator advised of having no information pertaining to the Building Official in Greene County having ever worked in Madison County.

- *Supervisor Hoffman: Suggested that efforts continue with Culpeper County as reported*

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Board to allow the County Administrator and County Attorney to continue moving forward with today's proposal pertaining to securing an interim Building Official for the County.

b. Pete's Auction Service: Chairman Jackson referred to the memorandum submitted by Pete Elliott to request that the two (2) proffers be removed.

Pete Elliott (Pete's Auction Service) was present and advised that when he opened the business, a special use permit was issued by the County to allow for two (2) auctions per month. It was also suggested that he proffer to have signage and law enforcement personnel in the area. Once the business was open, the property was rezoned to B-1, and auctions transpired 4-5 times per month. However, some citizens have verbalized concerns that the signage and flashing lights from the law enforcement vehicle create a hazard by causing vehicles to slam on brakes as they crest the hill and see the flashing lights. VDOT has also indicated that (in their opinion) the signage is being used to 'advertise' his business, although the signage was a part of the proffers that were agreed upon. He also advised that:

- ✓ There are currently three (3) other businesses on the property
- ✓ Auctions sometimes bring in 200+ vehicles to the property
- ✓ The assigned deputy is only on site for two (2) hours

And It's felt that the signage and position of law enforcement helps to keep the roadway safe. In closing, he noted that business will continue whether or not the County elects to lift the existing proffers, and also advised that the proffers were imposed by the county and not the state.

Comments from the Board:

- *Chairman Jackson: Referred to the minutes in 2001; proffers are noted in the special use permit and conditional zoning application (which Mr. Elliott did agree to when the property was rezoned); also noted concerns regarding the 'process' involved which will need to be undertaken in order to have the proffers removed; agreed with the citizen concerns about the sign presence of a deputy at the roadway to be excessive; the County Attorney has contacted VDOT; would like to attain input from VDOT; feels the request needs to go through the public hearing process; verbalized appreciation for the level of business that the auction house brings to the County; feels that waiver of fees will set a bad precedence*
- *Supervisor Campbell: Referred to the past concerns regarding the request and letters from VDOT that approved the request without any conditions (noted by letter) and that no issues were found with the initial request; feels the Board has complete authority to do away with the proffers; feels it's unjustified to make the business owner pay any more money*

Supervisor Campbell moved that the Board remove the restrictions (i.e. proffers) required of Pete Elliott (Pete's Auction Service, Inc.) based on VDOT approval (without conditions) on the special use permit application and the rezoning application, seconded by Supervisor McGhee.

Discussion:

The County Attorney advised that Betty Grayson, Zoning Administrator, is on vacation. He verbalized concerns about the process involved and recognized the validity of the argument being presented that are valid. Additionally, he noted that proffers are things that the applicant voluntarily does and that "the County can't impose proffers". He also noted that there was probably some discussion during the public hearing process, and noted that the applicant (Mr. Jordan) submitted the proffers as agreed.

Mr. Elliott noted that he 'agreed to the proffers' (not Mr. Jordan).

The County Attorney further explained that Mr. Elliott is seen as 'the agent for Mr. Jordan' in the rezoning request (and not the special use permit).

After discussion, Chairman Jackson clarified that:

- The special use permit is 'null and void'
- Rezoning Application: Contractor is noted as W. J. Carpenter Co., Inc. c/o E. W. 'Bill' Jordan on the application

The County Attorney further explained that there is a provision in the State Code that allows for waiver of certain proffers and specifically states that 'the proffers cannot effect the use of the property', (which in his opinion) means that many proffers have financial aspects involved. Additionally, he feels that this is what the government intended in order to be able to waive financial proffers without the need to hold a public hearing. He also noted that larger localities are able to impose fees, but Madison County isn't able to impose fees. Most proffers established by larger localities do include some financial considerations, and are established because of the use involved. Although it may be appropriate to eliminate the existing proffers, he feels that emphasis was made on the 'process', even though Mr. Jordan may be willing to sign on the request to release the existing proffers.

- *Supervisor Campbell: Noted that the application contains Mr. Jordan's name; conditions of the proffers require anyone else at the rezoned property to follow the same requirements (as Mr. Elliott) if a special event is held at the site; referred to a weekend business operating in Brightwood that doesn't follow the guidelines as established*
- *Chairman Jackson: Feels that the applicant (Mr. Jordan) should be asking for removal of the existing proffers (instead of Mr. Elliott) since he is the actual applicant*

The existing proffers were read as follows for the record:

PROFFERS:

1. With the exception of restoring one structure destroyed by the snowfall of February 2010, no new construction is planned. Any new building, or addition to the present facility, will be submitted for review under applicable state and local regulations and ordinances, as well as a VDOT review of a highway traffic impact study provided by the property owner.
2. Any tenant hosting a specific event, with traffic comparable to Pete's Auction Services, will be required to place a message board in a VDOT approved location to inform highway users of the necessity to use caution regarding the special event ahead. In addition, a deputy in a marked law enforcement vehicle with blinking lights will be located at the site entrance, for a minimum of 2 hours.

- *Supervisor Campbell: Referenced that the proffer doesn't specifically require Pete's Auction Service to have a message board and law enforcement present; urged the Board to take a precedence and correct what (in his opinion) has been wrongfully done*
- *Supervisor Weakley: Referred to a suggestion to have VDOT look at the site and provide recommendations in order for the Board to move forward with the appropriate process*

Steve Hoffman was present and advised that (in his opinion) the Board of Supervisors has the authority to rule on tonight's decision; the planning commission doesn't have any legislative authority and can only make recommendations. He also noted that if the proffers apply to 'term of reduction as opposed to a term of an increase', the request could be handled without the need for a public hearing. In closing, he noted that although the planning commission made a recommendation to the Board, the Board of Supervisors has the authority to 'undo a decision. He did verbalize agreement with a comment made by the County Attorney that noted that the property owner (E. W. "Bill" Jordan) does need to make the request for release of proffers since the rezoning application is actually in his name.

- *Chairman Jackson: Questioned the cost to have law enforcement on site; also questioned how a future Board can 'undo' terms (established by a prior Board) without holding a public hearing process*

Mr. Elliott advised that he was opposed to the 'process', and would be fine if things remain as they are. He further noted that today's concerns were brought forth based on citizen concerns. He also advised that law enforcement is compensated \$50.00 per auction sale conducted at the site. He also questioned what would happen if he utilized funds to initiate changes at the request of the County and VDOT decides to leave things 'as is' or impose further changes. He also noted that VDOT wasn't involved in the original process, and stated that he isn't asking 'for any favors' from the County.

Mr. Hoffman explained that the current Board cannot approve anything beyond the term of its current membership.

- *Supervisor Hoffman: Verbalized favor of Mr. Elliott's concerns regarding the proffers; advised favor of the Board rescinding the proffers if there are no legal ramifications as a result*
- *Supervisor McGhee: Verbalized concerns regarding the proffers; also referred to the definition of "use – brief and/or seasonal" and feels this may cause some issues; suggested the Board not 'rush' with the process and make a situation that will need to be undone in the future.*

Mr. Elliott also noted that his business is legally able to operate under the 'use – seasonal/brief' definition, but feels this isn't the right way to conduct business.

Ayes: Campbell. Nays: Jackson, Weakley, McGhee, Hoffman.

After discussion, Chairman Jackson suggested this item be added to "Old Business" on the next meeting Agenda. The County Administrator has made contact with Joel DeNunzio, VDOT Residency Administrator, to assess VDOT's opinion.

Furthermore (in his opinion):

- ✓ Proffers don't appear to be a way (for the County) to do good business
- ✓ Moving forward with a change today would set a bad precedence

Mr. Elliott further explained that the area in question doesn't have a deceleration lane and that proffers were initiated in order to make the area safer by utilizing signage and law enforcement personnel. Furthermore, he agreed to the proffers in order to get the rezoning application passed by the County. In closing, he asked to be contacted if VDOT has additional requirements before he files an application with the Zoning Administrator.

After discussion, it was noted that Chairman Jackson will contact Mr. Elliott within two (2) weeks to report VDOT findings.

c. County Signs: Supervisor Hoffman asked for the Board's permission to move forward with putting "Welcome to Madison" signs at each entrance to the County (i.e. North/South); she suggested the County Administrator contact some of the surrounding localities to see where they obtained signage, associated costs, and VDOT regulations pertaining to follow through on this matter.

Supervisor Campbell moved that the Board authorize the County Administrator to proceed with research on the purchase of "Welcome to Madison" signage for the North and South entrance to Madison County, seconded by Supervisor Weakley.

Discussion:

- *Supervisor Weakley: Verbalized favor of this suggestion; feels this is something that will showcase our County*

Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).

10. Public Comment

Chairman Jackson opened the floor for public comment.

The following individual provided comment(s).

- ✓ Joe May: Asked to make comments about the Ameresco Proposal after input is provided on this matter
- ✓ Steve Hoffman: Accolades to the Board of Supervisors for doing a fine job

With no further comments being brought forth, Chairman Jackson closed the public comment opportunity

11. Information/Correspondence:

a. Ameresco Proposal: Chairman Jackson advised that he values the relationship between the County and school board. Also advised that the school board will be voting on the Ameresco proposal at tomorrow evening's meeting (RFP expires on 9/30/17) and will shift the proposal to the County to be the judge of whether to provide appropriate funding. He noted that the proposal isn't based on whether the County can afford the costs, but whether the County feels the proposal is a good deal for the County overall. The County Attorney is currently reviewing the proposed contract, and the County will need to decide whether to fund the proposed endeavor. In closing, he noted that paperwork will be provided for review/assessment, and this matter will be added for a future agenda for review, discussion, and/or approval.

Bob Chappell (school board) was present and advised that the proposal may not pass, but did advise that the school board is interested in saving (the citizens) money on energy expenses for the school system, in the event the County is willing to cover the proposed costs.

Comments:

- *Supervisor Campbell: Verbalized disfavor of the proposal from Ameresco; noted that the CIP Committee meetings ceased as soon as the aforementioned proposal was brought before the County for approval; feels that (in his opinion) the school board is waiting for his term to end before initiating further CIP meetings because of his verbalizations regarding 'wasting money' on stuff that should've been done when the County initially borrowed funding two (2) years ago; feels the proposal is an 'absolute waste of money'; also commented on the types of fixtures used for bathroom upgrades (at the high school) as being non-efficient for the current plumbing equipment that is in place*
- *Supervisor Weakley: Verbalized favor of being efficient and saving the citizens' money; feels that a better value could be attained by pursuing the bidding process; noted that Ameresco is in the business of making money on projects; the school system was successful with the prior project (by hiring John Barrett) and feels the County can build on that type of model*

Mr. Chappell noted that Mr. Barrett is no longer available to provide services as a clerk of the Works

- *Chairman Jackson: Advised that the HVAC (primary school) and windows (middle school) definitely need to be replaced, and maintenance issues also need to be taken care of; suggested the County wait to see what the school board brings forth.*
- *Supervisor Hoffman: Noted that the County and school board do have a good working relationship; apologized for prior comment made by Supervisor Campbell (that officials are waiting for his term to end before taking action on specific matters)*
- ✓ Joe May: Advised that (in his opinion) Ameresco's proposal is similar to endeavors encouraged by:
 - ✚ "Go Virginia" (\$20,000,000 program to give folks [like Ed Scott) a job)
 - ✚ Governor Terry McAuliffe (request to run the voting commission to control the general assembly and trying to convince the Commonwealth to finance a car factory)
 - ✚ Endeavor to build a car factory in Mississippi (as encouraged by Governor McAuliffe) that resulted in disaster and was recommended in order to offer permanent legal residency visas to wealthy Chinese citizens
 - ✚ Ameresco proposal is a lobbyist endeavor that will provide a pay-off
 - ✚ Feels that folks have to 'buy' their way onto congressional committees
 - ✚ Questioned demographics in relation to the juvenile detention center, and if this is something the County will start seeing more of
- ✓ Bruce Bowman: Advised that the next Blue Ridge Committee meeting is scheduled for October 5th at Big Meadows – the business meeting will begin at 9:00 a.m. followed by lunch and a tour of the Hoover Camp

Emphasis was also made on:

- ✚ The future of our youth
- ✚ The lack of mental health services in the County

12. Closed Session – if necessary: None

13. Adjournment

With no further action being required, Supervisor Hoffman moved to adjourn tonight's meeting, seconded by Supervisor Weakley, Chairman Jackson adjourned the meeting. *Ayes: Jackson, Weakley, Campbell, McGhee, Hoffman. Nays: (0).*

R. Clay Jackson, Chairman
Madison County Board of Supervisors

Clerk of the Board of the Madison County Board of Supervisors

Adopted on: October 24, 2017

Copies: Board of Supervisors, County Attorney & Constitutional Officers



Call to Order

**Agenda (Amended)
Regular Meeting (#2)
Madison County Board of Supervisors
Tuesday, September 26, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.
County Administration Building, Auditorium
414 N Main Street, Madison, Virginia 22727**



Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

1. *Determine Presence of a Quorum / Adopt agenda*
2. *Public Comment*
3. *Constitutional Officers*
4. *County Departments*
5. *Committees or Organizations*
6. *Finance:*
 - a. *August 2017 Claims*
 - b. *Supplemental Appropriations (if any)*
 - i. *FY17 True Up Adjustment for Rappahannock Juvenile Detention Center – I have discussed this previously with you*
 - ii. *Revised Victim Witness Budget & Including Compensation Adjustment for Jennifer Hayes (retroactive to 8/1)*
7. *Minutes:*
 - a. *#30*
8. *Old Business:*
 - a. *Reassessment RFP & Memo*
9. **New Business:**
 - a. *Building Official Services*
 - b. *Pete's Auction Service (Proffers) – Pete Elliott*
 - c. **Madison County Signs – Supervisor Hoffman**
10. *Public Comment*
11. *Information/Correspondence (if any)*
12. *Closed Session (if needed)*
13. *Adjournment*

AMENDMENTS NOTED IN ROYAL BLUE WITH YELLOW HIGHLIGHT